

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
Richmond Division**

**In re:** )  
 )  
 )  
**CIRCUIT CITY STORES, INC.** ) **Chapter 11**  
 )  
 )  
 )  
**Debtor.** )  
 )  
 )

**CREDITOR JONATHAN CARD'S RESPONSE TO DEBTORS' THIRTIETH  
OMNIBUS OBJECTION TO CLAIMS [DISALLOWANCE OF CERTAIN INVALID  
CLAIMS, DOCKET NO. 11808]**

COMES NOW, Creditor Jonathan Card, through his undersigned counsel, pursuant to Fed. R. Brankr. P. 3007, Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(D), and this Court's April 1, 2009 Order Establishing Omnibus Objection Procedures and Approving the Form and Manner of Notice of Omnibus Objections [Docket No. 2881], and responds to the Debtors' Thirty-First Objection to Claims [Disallowance of Certain Legal Claims] [Docket No. 4585] and states as follows:

## Argument

1. The Debtors filed voluntary petitions under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code on November 10, 2008 and continue to manage their affairs as debtors-in-possession.
2. On August 29, 2002, Creditor Jonathan Card filed his lawsuit on behalf of himself and all other assistant managers employed by Debtors seeking overtime compensation, compensation for missed meal and rest breaks, waiting time penalties and attorneys' fees under California law. The class action-styled case, which is entitled *Card v. Circuit City, Inc.*, is filed in the San Diego Superior Court, Case No. 37-2008-00095260.

1 Creditor Jonathan Card seeks to represent all California-based assistant managers who  
2 were employed by Debtors and who were not paid overtime compensation, or provided  
3 meal and rest breaks.

4 3. On January 13, 2009, pursuant to this Court's Order regarding creditor claims, Creditor  
5 Jonathan Card - through his counsel - filed a timely creditor claim with the bankruptcy  
6 administrator, Kurtzman Carson Consultants.

7 4. Debtors are in exclusive possession of the information necessary for Creditor Card to  
8 value this claim in any more detail. Specifically, Debtors hold the payroll, employment  
9 and time records, including the pay rates and number of weeks worked by Creditor Card  
10 180 days prior to November 10, 2008 (the Petition Date).

11 5. Further, since Debtors' filing of its voluntary petition, the trial court proceedings of  
12 Creditor Card have been stayed under Code of Civil Procedure section 916 and also  
13 pursuant to the federal bankruptcy law "automatic stay" rules. Due to the automatic  
14 stay, Creditor's counsel is prohibited from conducting discovery on any issues  
15 (certification, merits or damages) against Debtors that would be necessary to further  
16 evaluate Creditor Card's claim with more particularity.

17 6. Debtors' counsel has informed Creditor's counsel that this will be a "liquidating"  
18 bankruptcy. In addition, Debtors' counsel informed Creditor Card that given Debtors'  
19 limited financial resources, matters that would otherwise be returned to trial court(s) are  
20 being kept in the Bankruptcy Court in order to curb the cost of litigating claims.

21 7. Debtors' Objection, which seeks to disallow the claims of Creditor Card is improper.  
22 Creditor Card is prepared to respond in detail to any factual or legal grounds that Debtor  
23 believes would tend to support disallowance of this claim, yet without such information  
24 he is "shadow boxing" - unable to understand, let alone respond to, contentions and  
25 arguments that have to date not been disclosed. With its Objection, Debtors essentially  
26 seek to disallow Creditor Card's claims for reasons that are completely unknown and  
27 simply because they think proclaim "no liability." The only basis for the objection is  
28 the unremarkable conclusion that Debtors have decided the claims have no merit. This

1 kind of ipse dixit argument is as unsurprising as it is unhelpful to the Court's ability to  
2 make a fair determination of the claim.

3 8. Card's claims arise under California law. Similar to federal law, wages have always  
4 been afforded special status in California. The California Supreme Court has recently  
5 explained the strong public policy supporting claims of this nature:

6 The public policy in favor of full and prompt payment of an  
7 employee's earned wages is fundamental and well established: 'Delay  
8 of payment or loss of wages results in deprivation of the necessities  
9 of life, suffering inability to meet just obligations to others, and, in  
10 many cases may make the wage-earner a charge upon the public.'

11 (*Kerr's Catering Service v. Department of Industrial Relations*  
12 (1962) 57 Cal.2d 319, 326) California has long regarded the timely  
13 payment of employee wage claims as indispensable to the public  
14 welfare: "It has long been recognized that wages are not ordinary  
15 debts, that they may be preferred over other claims, and that, because  
16 of the economic position of the average worker and, in particular, his  
17 dependence on wages for the necessities of life for himself and his  
18 family, it is essential to the public welfare that he receive his pay  
19 when it is due. [Citations.] An employer who knows that wages are  
20 due, has ability to pay them, and still refuses to pay them, acts  
21 against good morals and fair dealing, and necessarily intentionally  
22 does an act which prejudices the rights of his employee." (*In re  
23 Trombley* (1948) 31 Cal.2d 801, 809-810; see *Gould v. Maryland  
24 Sound Industries, Inc.* (1995) 31 Cal.App.4th 1137 [statute  
25 criminalizing prompt payment violations shows "the policy involves  
26 a broad public interest, not merely the interest of the employee"].)

27  
28 *Smith v. Superior Court* (2006) 39 Cal.4th 77, 82.

1 In another case, the California Supreme Court explained:

2 Considerations of sound public policy buttress our conclusion. Labor  
3 Code section 1194 confirms "a clear public policy ... that is  
4 specifically directed at the enforcement of California's minimum wage  
5 and overtime laws for the benefit of workers." (citation omitted) As  
6 defendant's own authority reminds us, California's overtime laws are  
7 remedial and are to be construed so as to promote employee  
8 protection. (citation omitted.) And, as we have recognized, "this state  
9 has a public policy which encourages the use of the class action  
10 device." (citation omitted.) "By establishing a technique whereby the  
11 claims of many individuals can be resolved at the same time, the class  
12 suit both eliminates the possibility of repetitious litigation and  
13 provides small claimants with a method of obtaining redress for  
14 claims which would otherwise be too small to warrant individual  
15 litigation."

16 *Sav-on Drug Stores, Inc. v. Superior Court* (2004) 34 Cal.4th 319, 340.

17

18 9. This creditor is prepared to respond to any specific factual and/or legal arguments that  
19 pertain to a fair determination of this claim.

20 10. Creditor Card has submitted a demand to Debtors' counsel, based on Debtors' counsel  
21 expressing interest at resolving these claims. If the parties are not able to resolve these  
22 claims informally, Creditor is prepared to litigate them in this Court or in California.

23 Respectfully submitted,

24 Dated: May 2, 2012

**RIGHETTI GLUGOSKI, P.C.**

25  
26 s/ Michael Righetti

27  
28 Michael Righetti  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney for Creditor

# PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

I am employed in the County of San Francisco, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the action. My business address is Righetti Glugoski, P.C., 456 Montgomery Street, Suite 1400, San Francisco, California, 94104.

On Thursday, May 03, 2012 I served the foregoing document described as:

**CREDITOR JONATHAN CARD'S RESPONSE TO DEBTORS' THIRTIETH  
OMNIBUS OBJECTION TO CLAIMS [DISALLOWANCE OF CERTAIN INVALID  
CLAIMS, DOCKET NO. 11808]**

on the interested parties by administering a true copy either by facsimile or in sealed envelopes addressed as follows:

Paula Steinhilber Beran  
Travender & Beran, PLC  
20 North Eighth Street  
Second Floor  
Richmond, Virginia 23219  
pberan@tb-lawfirm.com

Robert J. Feinstein  
Pachulski Stang Ziehl and Jones  
780 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10017  
[rfeinstein@pszjlaw.com](mailto:rfeinstein@pszjlaw.com)

(X) VIA ECF ELECTRONIC MAIL

By emailing the above documents referenced to the recipients listed herein.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct and was executed on Thursday, May 03, 2012, at San Francisco, California.

Sarah Minkus  
Sarah Minkus